

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 062 554

VT 015 272

AUTHOR Tapman, Muriel Shay
TITLE Two Million Without Skills.
INSTITUTION Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau
of Educational Personnel Development.
PUB DATE Feb 72
NOTE 59p.

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.65 HC-\$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Needs; *Educational Opportunities;
*Federal Laws; Government Role; *Handicapped
Children; Handicapped Students; Interagency
Coordination; Skill Development; *Vocational
Education

IDENTIFIERS Education of the Handicapped Act; Education
Professions Development Act; Vocational Education
Amendments of 1968

ABSTRACT

Nearly 2 million handicapped children will be leaving school by 1977 without skills necessary for productive participation in society. This paper considers some of the problems which have arisen in implementing a commitment to vocational education for the handicapped, and reviews the relevant Federal laws. The discussion of the laws points out questions which must be answered before the Federal commitment to vocational education for the handicapped can be considered entirely successful. The overall conclusion is that a communications gap exists within the agencies responsible for implementation of the legislation. (BH)

ED 062554

"TWO MILLION WITHOUT SKILLS"

Muriel Shay Tapman
Project Officer
Vocational Education
Personnel Program
DHEW-OE-BEPD

February, 1972

VT015272

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Acknowledgement of their contributions is given especially to the Personnel Development Coordinators in all of the States and Territories who have offered their advice and counsel.

Particularly appreciated is the assistance and cooperation which have been received from the professional staff of the Vocational Education Personnel Program; Lloyd Briggs, Paul Manchak and Frank Perazzoli, in securing information and materials. Betty June Milam and Brenda White have been uncomplaining about assisting me in meeting my Program responsibilities.

Three experts in the field of vocational education have been particularly helpful in securing material for me: Gerald Klein, Georgia State Board for Vocational Education, Bill Loveless, Texas Education Agency and Len Trout of the University of Nevada.

Barbara Goss is particularly appreciated, since she typed the paper from a very rough draft.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>SECTION</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
SECTION I: BACKGROUND OF THE PROBLEM	
A. Purpose of This Paper	1
B. Basis For My Concern	1
C. Specific Responsibility	2
D. Parameters of the Problem	2
E. Concern With Affective Federal Legislation	3
F. Federal Administrative Units Concerned	4
G. Commitment of Bureaus	5
SECTION II: AFFECTIVE FEDERAL LEGISLATION & ADMINISTRATION	
A. Education of the Handicapped Act (P.L.91-230)	7
B. Vocational Education Amendments (P.L.90-576)	13
C. Education Professions Development Act(P.L.90-35)	22
SECTION III: CONCLUSIONS	
A. The Questions From Analysis	42
B. Summary	46
APPENDIX I: BIBLIOGRAPHY	
APPENDIX II: IDENTIFICATION OF ALPHABET TERMS	
APPENDIX III: ABSTRACTS- VOCATIONAL EDUCATION FOR HANDICAPPED	

"TWO MILLION WITHOUT SKILLS"

SECTION ONE

BACKGROUND OF THE PROBLEM

"TWO MILLION WITHOUT SKILLS"

Section One

BACKGROUND OF THE PROBLEM

A. Purpose of This Paper

The two million will be identified later in this paper as the handicapped with little or no job skill development resulting from vocational education in the public school system. This paper is addressed to some of the problems which have been encountered in implementing a commitment to vocational education for the handicapped. It will analyze the legislative basis for a Federal concern as well as the resulting administrative process. It will raise questions which seem to be appropriate and which have not been satisfactorily answered. This paper, however, is not a paper with answers, because I do not believe that this can be done effectively by one person or one group, but can only be done by facilitators in all of the groups concerned with vocational education for the handicapped.

B. Basis For My Concern

As a Project Officer in the United States Office of Education, my assignment is in the Bureau of Educational Personnel Development which is now re-organized into the National Center for Improving Educational Systems BEPD (NCIES) and has committed a portion of its resources to vocational education for the handicapped. The discharge of this commitment is assigned to the BEPD program entitled Vocational Education Personnel Program.

Seventy-five percent of the funds for this Program are allocated to the State Systems for Personnel Development. This Program is my responsibility. The Program will soon meld into the Career Education Program concentrated on the appropriate kinds of personnel development including vocational education personnel development.

C. Specific Responsibility

The particular responsibility assigned to me is to monitor Federal funding, develop strategies used, and consult with State personnel development coordinators of vocational education in the implementation of a systematic approach to meeting the need for personnel in vocational education programs including those for the handicapped. The use of systematic strategies by a State require both needs assessment and resource development in a parity relationship of involvement and responsibility with the local school system, the community and the institutions of higher education. The systematic approach used by the States results in the development of objectives in priority order. The needs expressed by these objectives are then compared to the State resources available. This comparison defines the unmet needs. Funds can be requested from VEPP for these unmet personnel development needs for which other resources are not available if these are defined in the systematic approach utilized.

D. Parameter of the Problem

The parameters of a concern for the development of competent personnel for vocational education of the handicapped need to be set by the dimensions

of the problem. Information on the extent of this problem was available in the information given as back-up for its priority objectives by the Bureau for the Education of the Handicapped in the U.S. Office of Education. BEH declared that:

"Nearly two million handicapped children will be leaving school by the year 1977 without skills necessary for self-support or participation in society. Many of them become welfare recipients instead of contributors to society. For handicapped youth to really have outlets to improve their life potential, research and experimentation to develop special vocational models must be developed" (unpublished, Bureau for the Education of the Handicapped, United States Office of Education, Washington, D.C.; Fiscal Year 1972 OBJECTIVE Justification).

In the same document, their five-year planning goal for 1972-77 was "to assure an effective national commitment to provide full educational opportunity for all handicapped children and youth." In addition, their 1972 Subobjectives as the first step for accomplishing this goal, listed CAREER EDUCATION as the number two priority. The outcome of this subobjective is the "increase of career education programming to include an additional 250,000 children who will be trained for productive and realistic life work." In the Justification section of the same document, the following statement is made:

"Best information from State education agencies indicate that there are relatively few meaningful career education programs for the handicapped and that only a very small number of children are being appropriately served."

E. Concern With Affective Federal Legislation

This paper is concerned: (1) with the three pieces of Federal legislation which have an effective relationship to this goal; (2) with the three

administrative units designated to administer this legislation in the U.S. Office of Education; and (3) with how these units perceive their role. As an unmet National need, there should be a high priority given to vocational education for the handicapped. However, during the past two years BEPD has sought to identify an exemplary personnel development project for the handicapped which we believe to be of the high quality required for demonstration. No State has approached us with one they would like to demonstrate.

The excerpts from the BEH objective set the parameters of the problem to be examined. This examination will focus on the problem of 'enlightened federalism' through administration of the Federal legislation concerned with vocational education for the handicapped. 'Enlightened federalism' occurs when strategies are utilized which result in a parity relationship between the Federal level and the State level in which each is receptive to the others' input resulting in a needed goal being addressed and hopefully, achieved. The three administrative units and their authorizing legislation are described briefly in the next three paragraphs.

F. Federal Administrative Units Concerned

The Bureau of Education for the Handicapped has expressed its concern by its 1972 Objective. This administrative set-up is required by the Bureau's enabling legislation, Education for the Handicapped Act (P.L. 91-230). This concern is explored in Part A of Section II. This will include an analysis of their use of the term "career education" and the visibility of their strategy in meeting the objective.

The Bureau for Adult, Vocational and Technical Education is the one who administers the provisions of the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 (P.L. 90-576). This Bureau's concern with vocational education for the handicapped is shared by the State Boards for Vocational Education. The role that has been assumed by this partnership is the topic of Part B in Section II.

The Vocational Education Personnel Program is authorized by Part F of the Education Professions Development Act (P.L. 90-35). It is administered in what has been the Bureau for Educational Personnel Development. This administrative set-up is not required by the Act, and it will soon become the National Center for Improving Educational Systems as previously mentioned. One of the ways that the concern of this Program for vocational education of handicapped can be demonstrated is in the personnel staffing pattern of the Branch directly responsible for managing the program. The staff includes handicapped personnel selected for their ability. Another way is that three of its six staff members are increasing their knowledge of handicapping conditions through graduate course work. Other strategies related to this commitment and the legislation involved will be discussed in more detail in Part C of Section II.

G. Commitment of Bureaus

All three of the Bureaus are committed to equal educational opportunity for all students to benefit from vocational education. One purpose of this paper is to examine the 'state of the art' of affective Federal legislation and its

administration in relation to vocational education for the handicapped. A purpose of nearly equal importance is to develop information on the logistic problems involved in achieving the needed career/vocational education for the handicapped.

"TWO MILLION WITHOUT SKILLS"

SECTION TWO

AFFECTIVE FEDERAL LEGISLATION AND ADMINISTRATION

- A. Education of the Handicapped Act (P.L. 91-230)
- B. Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 (P.L. 90-576)
- C. Education Professions Development Act (P.L. 90-35)

"TWO MILLION WITHOUT SKILLS"

Section Two

AFFECTIVE FEDERAL LEGISLATION AND ADMINISTRATION

A. Education of the Handicapped Act (P.L. 91-230)

The Education of the Handicapped Act, unlike either the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 (P.L. 90-576) or the Education Professions Development Act (P.L. 90-35), does not include a statement of purpose. This leads to some difficulty in comparing their purposes. The EHA simply lists the title which may be cited. It does define the term handicapped children as meaning:

"mentally retarded, hard of hearing, deaf, speech impaired, visually handicapped, seriously emotionally disturbed, crippled, or other health impaired children who by reason thereof require special education and related services" (1., page 467)

In the following analysis, both the legislation (EHA) and the unit (BEH) responsible for its administration are examined in order to determine their emphasis on vocational education. In addition, the BEH understanding of the difference between career and vocational education is analyzed.

1. EHA Definitions Relating to Vocational Education

As a matter of record, EHA does not mention vocational education in any part or section. However, it does include a definition of a higher education institution which indicates some concern at least for the technologies at the Junior College level. A two year institution is eligible for funding if it prepares technicians or semi-professionals in "engineering, scientific or other technological

fields which require the understanding of basic engineering, scientific or mathematical principles or knowledge" (1., page 468). The definition of secondary, moreover, includes an exception stating: "that it does not include any education beyond grade 12" (1., page 468). There is no reference in the Act to post-secondary vocational education which is defined by VEA (68) as being a school "used exclusively or principally for the provision of vocational education to persons who have completed or left high school and who are available for study in preparation for entering the labor market" (1., page 325). To anyone with a vocational education background, could EHA leave the impression that academically oriented education was of primary importance?

2. EHA Advisory Committee and Vocational Education

In addition it should be pointed out, the constituency of the EHA authorized National Advisory Committee on Handicapped Children could exclude vocational education. The only restriction in the Act is that it must include eight members who "shall be persons affiliated with educational, training or research programs for the handicapped" (1., page 469).

Unlike VEA (68) there is no requirement in the EHA that a State, in order to participate in the funding, must have a State advisory committee with vocational education representation. Does the exclusion of any mention of vocational education tend to de-emphasize its importance to the education of the handicapped? Perhaps some

consideration should be given to how the need for self support skills can be accomplished without input on a high level from vocational education?

3. BEH and Career or Vocational Education

It is important to developing communication between vocational and special education that a determination is made of what the term "career education" actually means in the BEH subobjective. Career education as a term first received official sanction in U.S.O.E. from its Commissioner, Sidney P. Marland, Jr., in his decisive presentation to the National Association of Secondary School Principals in Houston, Texas, on January 23, 1971 (3., page 13.) By April of 1971, one or two documents and some developmental work had been done (uncollated documents, not published, in U.S.O.E. and 3.).

By the Summer of 1971, it would have been highly improbable to have had any kind of data from any "meaningful career education program(s) for the handicapped" or for any other kind of student. There were only a few beginnings. The probability with greatest validity is that the data was in reference to vocational education. Unfortunately, the data was otherwise correct.

However, the substitution of the term 'career' for 'vocational' could be considered as being within the context of the General Report of the Advisory Council on Vocational Education of 1968

which called vocational education the BRIDGE BETWEEN MAN AND HIS WORK. This limitation is disputed effectively in one of the basic working papers postulating the premise considered basic to the development of career education in which Edwin L. Herr wrote:

"If a career development (education) theme is to be viable, such an appellation must come to describe the total educational enterprise not just a segment of it. If any one part or all of education is to deserve this label by bringing to reality in the lives of individual students the complex of experiences necessary to bridge education and work, more than narrowly defined job training is involved" (10., page 27).

Continued equating of the term career education with vocational education is inimical to its institutionalization, let alone its acceptance by educational practitioners. What kind of communicating process is necessary to rectify this kind of problem?

4. BEH and Funds for Vocational Education

One of the most frequently used measures for determining commitment is to analyze the use of the funds available for the established objective. An analysis of the funds proposed to be used by BEH for career education identified the primary source of funds as ten per cent of the funds requested for the priorities established by the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968. This is the same per cent required by the Amendments. The same percentage was applied to the funds requested for the Vocational Education Personnel Program authorized by the Education Professions Development Act, Part F. The amount of funds committed from those requested for EHA was less

than 2 percent of the total. What resources other than funds can be utilized to insure that career education is effective for the handicapped, if they do not commit BEH funds?

5. BEH Research in Vocational Education

Another measure of commitment, is the use of R & D funds. A search, through the BEH list of research and development funded projects from 1965, resulted in only eleven titles being identified as focused on vocational education of the handicapped. It should be noted that there is no doubt a great deal of training for work done through State departments of vocational rehabilitation in activities for handicapped out of school youths and adults. The Social Rehabilitation Services of the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare has not been considered in this examination, since this paper is concerned with vocational education for the handicapped in the school system. Six of the eleven titles identified were focused on the vocational education for the deaf. (12.)

6. Review of Analysis

All of this needs to be reviewed in light of a recent presentation by Commissioner Marland at the annual meeting of the American Council on Education:

"I have sometimes been charged with anti-intellectualism as I have advanced the career education theory. I hope that the reverse is true. I believe that elementary and secondary education will become more realistic, with the implicit motivation for academic learning undergirding the career mode. I also believe that those young people choosing higher education

following high school will do so with reason and purposefulness as distinct from a folklore of snobbery and that will be better for them and you will be better for them. The real hidden agenda under career education is the expectation for greater academic success for many thousands of young people in high school" (3., page 15).

The reverse side of the coin is anti-vocationalism which has a fixation that only a degree in the so-called academics can lead to respectability. The "undergirding of the career mode" needs to be realistically considered in order to assure a valid outcome to the career education subobjective which is part of the BEH objectives for 1972. That is, it should undergird the training of 17,000 new special education personnel and the upgrading of 5000 experienced classroom teachers who work in special education classrooms described in other subobjectives. One of the major aspects considered in developing exemplary projects authorized by VEA (68) by Gene Bottoms was that:

"The school must assume responsibility for assisting a student in the clarification of his goals; providing him with knowledge about the labor market; helping him in evaluating his qualifications and abilities in terms of job opportunities; assisting him in developing the flexibility needed for adjusting to a fluctuating society; providing him with appropriate preparation for entering a job; and providing special assistance to many students to help them maintain employment and move up from dead-end level jobs" (5., pages 5-6).

What kind of strategies can BEH develop to encourage this assumption of responsibility?

"TWO MILLION WITHOUT SKILLS"

Section Two

AFFECTIVE FEDERAL LEGISLATION AND ADMINISTRATION

B. Vocational Education Amendments (P.L. 90-576)

The Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 declare their purpose to be:

"To assist them (the States) to maintain, extend, and improve existing programs of vocational education, to develop new programs of vocational education.....so that persons of all ages in all communities of the State - those in high school, ...those with special educational handicaps.....will have ready access to vocational training.....of high quality which is realistic in the light of actual or anticipated opportunities for gainful employment, and which is suited to their needs, interests, and ability to benefit from such training" (1., page 319)

In the following paragraphs, examination is made of the Act and the administration of its required emphasis on vocational education for the handicapped.

1. VEA (68) Advisory Council Requirements

Not only does this declare that vocational education is for "those with special educational handicaps", but the Amendments also require the National Advisory Council on Vocational Education to "include persons (having experience) in the education of the handicapped persons" (1. page 322). In addition each State participating (which is all States and Territories) is required to establish a State advisory council which "shall include as members.....a person or persons having special knowledge, experience, or qualifications,

with respect to the special educational needs of physically or mentally handicapped persons" (1., page 323).

This makes it a legal requirement for all State Boards for Vocational Education to be in a position to receive advice and counsel from 'experts' on education for the handicapped. Of course, the viability of such a legal requirement is determined by the commitment of the individuals appointed, as well as the acceptance of their input. One of the duties of this council is to "evaluate vocational education programs, services, and activities assisted under this title" (1., page 324). What is their role perceived to be by those who appoint them, those who serve with them and those who serve in this role - representing the handicapped on the council? (What function does this required evaluation serve for vocational education for the handicapped?)

2. VEA (68) Control of Funds for the Handicapped

The uses of any funds appropriated under Part B of VEA68 include the restriction that:

"At least 10 percentum of each State's allotment of funds appropriated.....for any fiscal year beginning after June 30, 1969, shall be used only for the purpose" (1., page 329) of "vocational education for the handicapped who because of their handicapping condition cannot succeed in the regular vocational education program without special educational assistance or who require a modified vocational education program" (1., page 328).

The States are primarily managing these funds required for vocational education of the handicapped through a fiscal process called 'setasides'. The Rules and Regulations, completed for the Amendments in January of 1969 and later published in the Federal Register, repeat the language of the Amendments in Part 102, Subpart C, State Vocational Education Programs, (a) Application of percentage requirements with respect to use of Federal funds (11., page 97). The Rules and Regulations do not require such a system. Setasides, as interpreted by most State Boards, has meant that this ten percent is kept separately, is considered almost inviolate and is to be spent separately for separate kinds of students in separate kinds of vocational education. Little consideration has been given to use of funds for any other approach such as the assimilation of the handicapped into regular vocational programs. (The 15 percent disadvantaged is generally accounted for in the same way.) Possibly these so-called 'Special Needs' funds are administered in this fashion for two reasons: (a) it is easier accounting wise, and (b) as the result of a statement in the Rules and Regulations cited above that:

"Vocational education meeting more than one percentage requirement. If an expenditure for vocational education falls within more than one of the categories for which there is a percentage requirement (e.g. postsecondary education for disadvantaged, or for handicapped persons) it may be counted as an expenditure for vocational education in each such category. Such expenditure may be counted as an expenditure in each such category for the purpose of meeting the percentage requirements set forth in paragraph (a) of this section but for no other purpose" (11., page 99).

In other words this could permit the cost of a handicapped student who is disadvantaged and attending a postsecondary vocational program to be charged against all three percentage requirements. In neither case, does the Amendments or the Rules & Regulations require that the funds for vocational education of the handicapped be either set aside or used exclusively for modified vocational education outside the regular classroom or shop.

Unless our objective for the handicapped is sheltered vocational education in sheltered workshops in all cases, this approach can only ghettoize on all levels. Coping with their basic social and economic functions is considered to be a major problem to the handicapped. This is particularly true if they are to work productively in a non-handicapped society. When they are not prepared to function economically, the handicapped cannot survive in the technological world of today, let alone experience the joy of being a valued contributor to society.

3. VEA (68) State Administration of the 10 Percent for the Handicapped

The States receive their allocation from U.S.O.E. based on a formula developed out of the requirements of the Amendments (1., pages 328-329). Most of the States set up supervisory position(s) in a Special Needs or Program section for the handicapped like Kentucky - where the section includes exemplary, cooperative and disadvantaged programs, as well. In addition, there are legal

procedures followed like the "Memorandum of Understanding" with the State Department of Mental Health (4).

Nearly all of the States transfer the funds directly to some other State agency concerned with the Handicapped. In many cases, including Texas and Minnesota I have been told, there is an almost direct transfer of funds to vocational rehabilitation agencies or in some cases to divisions within the State department of education, as in California. Is the present method of disbursing the funds centered on being sure that ten percent is spent only for the handicapped or on the need of the handicapped student for high quality vocational education based on his needs?

4. VEA (68) Communication Problem on the Handicapped

In October, 1969, Peter Drucker read a paper - INFORMATION, COMMUNICATIONS AND UNDERSTANDING - before the Fellows of the International Academy of Management in Tokyo, Japan. This remark seem to be quite apropos of what happened between the legislative efforts of Congress and the administrative implementation by the State Boards for Vocational Education. In answering the question about what had we learned about the three terms in the title of his paper Mr. Drucker pointed out:

"We have learned, mostly through doing the wrong things,..... the four fundamentals of communications (are that) communications is perception,.....expectations,.....involvement (and that) communications and information are totally different (although) information presupposes functioning communications" (6., pages 4-5).

His discussion of communication being perception, is even more appropriate to the problem of making this legislative effort the change agent it was supposed to be. The old trite story about a tree crashing in a forest, and is there sound if no one is there, leads into these remarks:

"We know that the right answer to this is 'no'. There are sound waves. But there is no sound unless someone perceives it. Sound is created by perception. Sound is communication.....the implications of this rather trite statement are great indeed.....it means that it is the recipient who communicates.... the person who emits the communication does not communicate. He utters....he can only make it possible or impossible for a recipient or rather percipient - to perceive. Perception, we know, is not logic. It is experience" (6., page 5).

In the case of vocational education for the handicapped, Congress would be the 'communicator' and the State Board the 'percipient'. As Drucker goes on to say, "All one can communicate downward are commands, that is, pre-arranged signals. One cannot communicate downward anything connected with understanding, let alone with motivation" (6., page 16). How can State Boards be motivated to the commitment necessary for quality vocational education for the handicapped whose need has been communicated by Congress?

5. Vocational Education Research Relating to the Handicapped

Unlike the Bureau for the Education of the Handicapped who has its own Division responsible for research related to handicapping conditions, the Bureau of Adult, Vocational and Technical Education

does not have such a division. The Division of Vocational Education (BAVTE) administers VEA (68), Part B which has the 10 percent requirement for the handicapped as a service bureau rather than as an operation bureau. The actual administration of Part B is a State responsibility under the guidelines developed by DVTE.

(1., pages 327-329). Research and development projects concerned with vocational education are through what is now named the National Center for Educational Research and Development. This dichotomy of administration is based on a strong liaison agreement between DVTE and NCERD.

Information on research and development was secured through a document, ABSTRACTS OF RESEARCH AND RELATED MATERIALS IN VOCATIONAL AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION, issued by the ERIC Clearinghouse on Vocational and Technical Education at Ohio State University in Columbus, Ohio. This includes NCERD reports as well as other reports that are appropriate to the field and which are forwarded to ERIC for dissemination availability.

In the Fall, 1970 issue of ABSTRACTS, fourteen projects can be identified as being directed toward handicapping conditions. Most of these originated with a department of vocational rehabilitation. There were in addition a number of abstracts from reports concerned with correctional or some aspect of delinquent rehabilitation. The list of these fourteen can be found in Appendix III. Each is listed the ERIC

number in sequential order with project director and title followed by source of funding. The last report in this listing which is entitled RESEARCH VISIBILITY: THE DISADVANTAGED AND THE HANDICAPPED seems to be primarily concerned with the disadvantaged according to the abstract and is the only one listed from 1970.

6. Review of Analysis

This segregated approach and lack of visible commitment to vocational education for the handicapped may well result from what Arthur Lewis Chairman, Department of Curriculum and Instruction, University of Florida suggests:

"Stem(s) from the tendency to assume that once a problem (such as handicapping condition) is described and defined it is solved. Operationally, we forget that a clear statement of the problem is only the first step in John Dewey's problem-solving method. Too often, diagnosing a child's difficulty and categorizing him results in a feeling that he is no longer the responsibility of the regular school" (9., page 43).

If it is desirable, as many special educators believe, to offer viable education for as many handicapped children as possible within the regular schools, would this not be a particularly important approach for vocational education to investigate? Especially since Dr. Lewis states: "Attendance at a regular school improves the possibility that he (the handicapped student) will make an effective adjustment to his age mates and to adult society when he enters it" (9., page 43). How can this 'probability' receive serious consideration as a step to be taken by vocational education?

It should seem obvious that Congress considers the administration of all vocational programs must be with the State Boards for Vocational Education, since this is where the Amendments placed vocational education for the handicapped. However, it is understandable that vocational educators have been reluctant to take the lead in developing quality programs as was, I am sure, expected by Congress. After fifty some years of being pushed into the basements or facilities separate from the regular school, either actually or symbolically, as second class citizens, vocational educators do not feel sure that there are 'percipients' with whom to communicate their developing responsiveness to the "social impacts and qualities of today's living" by preparing "the worker and the citizen to participate effectively and meaningfully in decisions about what social changes shall occur and what methods shall be utilized to affect those changes" (7., page 17). This is how Dr. Jack Willers, Professor of Education at Auburn University, described the quality of life and its implications for the seventies in a recent report on the state of the art in vocational teacher education (7.). This compilation of nine different aspects of the state of the art of vocational teacher education, of which Dr. Willers paper is one, is an excellent basic document. Unfortunately, it has not as yet had a wide distribution to special educators and others who should be concerned. How can a forum be developed which encourages input from both vocational educators and special educators"

The continued adherence to anti-vocationalism was discussed by Donald Barr, Headmaster of Dalton School, in his recent collection of writings in the section, OUR MULTIPLE-CHOICE SOCIETY. He very pointedly stated:

"The appalling lack of dignity in the options open to the young person who does not go to college or should not go to college has led to a one way street called College or Else" (8., page 163).

"TWO MILLION WITHOUT SKILLS"

Section Two

AFFECTIVE FEDERAL LEGISLATION AND ADMINISTRATION

C. Education Professions Development Act (P.L. 90-35)

The Education Professions Development Act stated purpose is:

"to improve the quality of teaching and to help meet critical shortages of adequately trained educational personnel by (1) developing information on the actual needs for educational personnel, both present and long range; (2) providing a broad range of high quality training opportunities, responsive to changing manpower needs; (3) attracting a greater number of qualified persons into the teaching profession; (4) attracting persons who can stimulate creativity in the arts and other skills to undertake short-term or long-term assignments in education; and (5) helping to make educational personnel training programs more responsive to the needs of the schools and colleges" (1., page 291).

The analyses in the subsequent paragraphs focus on the process of developing a unit to administer this Act. In particular, the manner that this unit, BEPD, related this purpose to a commitment for personnel development for vocational education for the handicapped.

1. EPDA Advisory Council

The Act required that a National Advisory Council on the Education Professions be appointed. It was to "include persons broadly representative of the fields of education, the arts, the sciences, and the humanities, and of the general public, and a majority of them shall be engaged in the education of teachers" (1., page 292). Although the Act did not specify either vocational or special education expertize, each has had representation since the inception of the Council in 1967.

2. Historical Development of Federal Support of Teacher Education

The Act was a forward funding bill and had the unusual feature that funds were not appropriated until Fiscal Year 1969, due in part to NDEA Title XI still having authority through Fiscal Year 1968. This procedure permitted U.S.O.E. Commissioner Harold Howe to appoint a task force directed by Dr. Dwight Allen to formulate the plans for the new Bureau while continuing to meet the objectives of NDEA Title XI. This resulted in the formation of the Bureau of Educational Personnel Development.

Title XI was an amendment to the National Defense Education Act which had been enacted September 2, 1958 as the Nation geared to meet the Sputnik challenge. Titles VB and VI of NDEA, as originally passed, authorized funding of modern foreign language development and counseling and guidance training programs. By October of 1964 the need for teacher training in many fields was recognized when Title XI was enacted covering by 1968 specific training grants for teaching, supervising or training of teachers in eleven different specific fields. Fiscal year 1968 phased out this piecemeal approach focused on improving the qualifications of individuals. Fiscal year 1969 completed this phase out under EPDA. For instance, industrial arts, which was authorized as a category for Fiscal Year 1966, grew from five projects for that year to 32 in 1968 and down to 20, including three planning grants, in 1969.

With the implementation of EPDA in 1969, there began a move toward greater concentration of resources in fewer projects in order to increase the impact. For the first time in 1969 both vocational and special education were categories that received funding. The wide open guideline approach of 1969 led to some 3000 proposals being eventually categorized into some 35 areas in order that they could be evaluated. The greatest lottery, in the world was on its last legs. ('The greatest lottery in the world' was the term characterizing the proposal submission and funding process used by Dr. Donald Bigelow who administered the Title XI program and developed the TTT concept.) In vocational education's first year of participation, 1969, there were only 17 projects directly under EPDA with most of the funds being used for the last year of 4C projects administered by what was then the Bureau of Research.

3. BEPD Commitment to Special Education

In Fiscal Year 1970 (academic year 1970-71), eleven priority areas were identified for personnel development. These included vocational education and special education. As their evidence of their commitment, BEPD pledged fifteen percent of its funds to meeting the need for personnel for special education kinds of training. By agreement with BEH, these training funds were primarily for the training of educational personnel in the regular classroom to work effectively with the handicapped students. This was due to the

fact that the majority of the nation's handicapped children and youth now, as in the past, are educated in regular classrooms by regular teachers.

This commitment was to be met by a two pronged strategy. Funding projects in the EPDA Special Education Program was one. The other was to require the other ten priority areas to utilize 15 percent of their 1970 allocation for projects on education of the handicapped.

4. VEPP Commitment to the Handicapped Under Part D of EPDA

The Vocational Education Personnel Program as one of the ten priority areas funded under Part D of EPDA accepted this requirement as one focus of its program. One of the basic concerns of this Program, since its inception in 1969, was the need for insuring equal access to quality vocational education programs for all groups including the disadvantaged and the handicapped.

5. VEA (68) Impact on VEPP

In late 1968 the Vocational Education Amendments were passed, the part of the Amendments discussed in Chapter 2 was enacted as Title I. Title II was concerned with vocational education leadership and professional development. Congress amended it to EPDA as Part F which includes two project authorizing sections 552, and 553. Section 552 is titled LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT AWARDS. It is

a fellowship type program with the unique feature that the awards to the individual participant must be equally distributed geographically. Section 553's title was all encompassing, EXCHANGE PROGRAMS, INSTITUTES, AND INSERVICE EDUCATION FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION TEACHERS, SUPERVISORS, COORDINATORS AND ADMINISTRATORS. It is the only section of EPDA that includes no geographical distribution limitation. Section 552 is a relatively restrictive piece of legislation, setting up criteria both for the institutions and the awardees. Except for two restrictions that all grants must go to State Boards for Vocational Education and that Federal funds can only supplement and must not supplant, 553 is a very open ended piece of legislation (1., pages 309-312).

In the latter part of August of 1969, the determination was made that all EPDA funds for vocational education would be channeled through Part F. Since the EPDA appropriation request was already in the works when this amendment was made, this was not as automatic as it might seem. The EPDA request listed vocational education under Parts C and D. This decision meant the 1970 funding cycle, which technically began in January of that year, would become the first program year of the two Part F programs. Technically it began, however, a vetoed education appropriation bill delayed the issuance of most of the grants until at least April 1, 1970.

6. VEPP Leadership Development Program in 1970

The 552 program for 1970 became the Leadership Development Program with grants being awarded to eleven institutions of higher education with comprehensive vocational education programs, either underway or slated to be in operation by the following September. All eleven were in a school of graduate study, had a program approved by the State Board for Vocational Education and were encouraged by the State Board to apply. Late funding reduced the amount of lead time necessary for implementing any extensively unique or different program.

In contrast to other fellowship programs which had been funded by EPDA under Part C, the applicants for a fellowship did not apply directly to the university of their choice with a subsequent determination by the university alone as to acceptance. In the LDP, due to the legislative requirement for equitable distribution of awards to all of the states, the first step was determining from the funding available, \$1,400,000, that only 160 awards could be made. These were awarded to each State by a procedure which gave each State at least one award and distributed the balance by an equitable distribution formula.

To implement the application process, each State Board set up a procedure for nominating awardees, selection was generally based on the applicants leadership potential and capability perceived as contributing to the future of the State's vocational education programs.

Each State nominated a first choice with two alternates in choice order for each slot allotted. Each applicant for an award identified any preference of university among the eleven institutions, particularly any not desired. Each State's slate of nominees was then forwarded to U.S.O.E. where LDP staff assisted by designated staff from the Division of Vocational and Technical Education (BAVTE) distributed the first choice nominee applications, as nearly as possible to their choice of university, to the eleven universities funded. The project director of the university working usually with, a graduate school committee reviewed the backgrounds and academic records of the nominees for acceptance as graduate student. This process of getting the nominees into their assigned graduate school and thus into one of the eleven LDP programs, was fraught with complicated problems. Some were caused by deficiencies in the academic record of the nominees; some caused by the inflexibility of some university graduate schools and some due to drop-out nominees. Due to this, most of the awardees did not start their program until September, although all projects were authorized to start with the Summer session. The eleven institutions received an institutional assistance of \$3,100 per awardee for each year of a three year program. The awardees received a stipend based on \$3,500 per academic year plus a Summer stipend and an allowance for each dependent.

7. LDP Problems in Program Change

The preceding lengthy description of the implementation of LDP is included to indicate part of the reason why it was difficult, if not possible, to bring about any graduate program change necessary to articulate special and vocational education. In most graduate schools with the best intentions in the world, it is nearly possible to change the approved curriculum in such a short time frame. It was difficult enough to integrate the varied fields of vocational education into a comprehensive program let alone developing integration with the special education division when there have been little or no previous communication from either side. In addition, in a fellowship program, there is no federal accounting requirements with auditing control of the use of the \$3,100 institutional allowance paid to each university for a fellow or an awardee, a university could legally help with the general funds. With the critical need to design an articulated and effective comprehensive vocational education program as required by Section 552, the priority of each LDP director had to be the enrichment of his own division in order to offer the kind of program required by the awardees. Especially this is true during the first year that most of them had Federal funds available to do this. Even if the LDP directors were percipients of the need for vocational education to be concerned with special education, it is a two way street. Other EPDA programs such as the Special Education Program and the Teacher Corps are not reaching out to the vocational education program

or considering it as important to their goals. Unfortunately, this attitudinal set operates in their projects at the eleven LDP universities. If the vocational teacher educators, such as these 11 project directors, commit themselves to a concern for developing leadership personnel for vocational education programs for the handicapped, or for developing leadership personnel who can work with the handicapped in the regular program, how can equal concern or commitment be developed by special educators for the handicapped? There is no way vocational educators can impose this commitment without 'precipitants' who can understand, is there?

Most States from the awardee process had, at the most, one or two slots available that obviously could not show a 15% commitment to vocational education for the handicapped.

8. LDP Effectiveness in Meeting Commitment

The commitment of VEPP was certainly not met in a way that could be tied to a dollar value. The eleven institutions funded in 1970 and the seven added for 1971 are, or will attempt, to do this through a process of a 15% commitment of the awardee's time, sometimes by special courses, most often by special projects or assignments. At the present time, the eleven institutions are half way through their second academic year, the seven are half way through their first year.

9. BEPD Advisory Groups Concerned

As far as we have been able to discover, none of the project directors have at any time been contacted by any special educator on their campus with concern for vocational education. Including, it might be added, Dr. Maynard C. Reynolds who is director of the Leadership Training Institute for Special Education which is funded by EPDA. The LTI is located on the same campus as one of the eleven, the University of Minnesota. The Leadership Training Institute acts in a manner similar to a vocational education advisory committee. They direct their advice to the Personnel development needs. There is no vocational education expertise represented in this LTI.

The Vocational Education Personnel Program does not have an LTI, but does have an advisory committee for both Programs which includes a member with knowledge of education of the handicapped and who was recommended by BEH. Can the need of two million without skills, be met by a vocational education commitment alone?

10. Historical Perspective for Operation of Section 553

The concern of most State Boards for Vocational Education has been the quantity of the program available. This, after all, was where the public interest was. If vocational offerings were available, then the obligation to the public was met. This resulted in programs being developed where the pressure was, many programs being offered to

less than the minimum students required for cost effectiveness, and what was worse, the continuance of programs long after they failed to meet the needs of students or industry. This kind of situation was clouded by the competitiveness between school systems about the extensiveness of the offerings in one school system as opposed to another without regard to the need of each.

To most farsighted State Directors, this was both an insufficient and inefficient basis for determining need for the vocational education program. This attitude was crystalized in the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 (P.L. 90-576) in Section 123 of Part B, paragraph (6), subparagraphs (A) and (B), which required that "due consideration will be given" in the required State Plans for Vocational Education:

"to the results of periodic evaluations of State and local vocational education programs, services, and activities in the light of information regarding current and projected manpower needs and job opportunities, particularly new and emerging needs and opportunities on the local, State and national levels" in (A) and "to the relative vocational education needs of all population groups in all geographic areas and communities in the State, particularly persons with academic, socioeconomic, mental and physical handicaps that prevent them from succeeding in regular vocational education programs" in (B) (1., page 330)

The State Plans filed by July 1, 1969 were required to address these considerations, and in some fashion, an attempt was made to do this.

As Dr. Gerald Somers, Chairman of the Department of Economics as well as Director of the Center for Studies in Vocational and Technical

Education at the University of Wisconsin, recently wrote:

"...the efforts to translate manpower projections for particular occupations into enrollment in vocational education programs are to be commended on the basis of courage, but they are clearly based on herculean assumptions; and reasonable research analysts could arrive at very divergent assumptions. (7., page 304).

Dr. Somers critique of manpower projections for vocational education should become a basic document for those needing to enumerate or project need statistically in vocational education. Perhaps because it was considered outside the scope of his paper, he did not mention the problem of which some State Directors were becoming aware of the need for a staff trained to perform this job of information retrieval translated into statistical analysis.

The overall premise of the Amendments was a systematic approach based on some form of management by objectives (1., page 330).

Part F was considered to include the premise as well, since it was enacted by Congress as an integral part of the Amendments, even though it was made an amendment to EPDA. It was therefore necessary to administer it in line with that consideration, as well as from the focus that Congress, by placing it with the academic personnel development was emphasizing the necessity to no longer consider vocational teacher educators a separate entity from all other teacher educators.

11. Liaison Development

Being concerned with statewide strategies in vocational education necessitated the development of a strong liaison relationship between the Vocational Education Personnel Program administered in BEPD and the Division of Vocational and Technical Education located in BAVTE who administered the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968. This was done by a written agreement and through active collaboration of one staff with the other as appropriate.

12. Administering the Development of 553 in 1970

In Section 553 the Cooperative Arrangements Program, the Technical Assistance Program and the Special Developmental Projects Program were developed following the decision in 1969 to focus the funding on a Part F approach. The three programs were strategies developed to meet the needs of as many States as possible with the limited funding, \$3.6 million, available. Through prospectuses submitted and staff searching, it was determined that only fourteen states had the semblance of anything like a systematic approach to personnel development. These were funded under the Cooperative Arrangement Program for projects based on the unmet needs the States had described in their proposal with the understanding that 15 percent of the projects would be directed toward vocational education for the handicapped (the BEPD approach) or through personnel development for special programs (the BEH approach). In communicating to a

constituency who lumped the handicapped with the disadvantaged with little or no commitment to the handicapped beyond that legally required, we actually only "uttered" the information and the "percipients" did not understand. The result was, that in the main, the need to achieve smoother articulation of vocational and special education services was not met. How can a concern be developed for training professionals to make the appropriate vocational and special education articulation happen?

The Technical Assistance Program funded 24 States with small amounts (\$10,000 or less) for developing a systematic approach with a needs assessment and the identification of the personnel development objectives for such a system. The Special Developmental Projects Program funded a limited number of projects varying from the development of the first vocational and industrial arts teacher education resource in the District of Columbia to developing a model statewide approach to rural vocational education in Kentucky. An attempt was made to identify a model for personnel development in vocational education for the handicapped. This attempt was not and has not been successful through the '71 funding cycle.

LDP in 1971

In 1971 the LDP had \$1.9 million available. Seven additional institutions were added with Federal support for eight awardees at each. These were distributed to the states by an extension of the

original, 1970 distribution formula. Twenty-one states received no new slots. In addition, the seven states where the institutions were located are supporting at least four more awardees at each institution. These seven are committed to attempting to develop some sort of articulation with special education. The eleven institutions have funding committed for three years for their doctoral programs through the academic year of 1972-73. The seven have a commitment through 1973-74. There will be no new projects under this program for the 1972 funding cycle. Efforts will be concentrated on the continuing development of the 18 already funded. It is hoped that during the academic year of 1972-73 that there can be a first order conviction developed by all 18 directors similar to that of Dr. Evelyn Deno, Professor of Educational Psychology, at the University of Minnesota when she recently wrote:

"Whatever distinctions can be made between regular(vocational education) and special education are mainly organizational and not substantive, that is, the manner in which learning experiences need to be presented is the main basis of distinction. Whatever learning principles apply to handicapped children apply to all children and end goals are the same in their most essential aspects" (9., pages 12-20).

It is hoped that Dr. Deno would accept the parenthetical expression inserted in her paper.

Perhaps part of the primary purpose of leadership development in these eighteen institutions for the 72-73 academic year will be a permeability to change in developing the necessary articulation skills

for assuming leadership in working with the handicapped.

Recognizing the resistance to change is a real problem in institutions as Dr, Melton Martinson, Director of Administrative Training Program at the University of Kentucky, did when he recently wrote in WE HAVE MET THE ENEMY AND THEY IS US that:

"training programs and specialized demonstration projects have a marked resistance to this type of permeability (to change). It is evident that very frequently programs or projects in the same department in particular universities or colleges sadly lack provisions to coalesce functions and resources among programs and departments....seldom are programs and departments internally integrated for coordinated impact on particular aspects of training among positional levels" (9., page 28).

13. 553 in 1971

Dr. Martinson's description would, apply equally to State departments of education, State Boards for Vocational Education and school systems. Since resistance to change is somewhat reduced by perception and involvement, this led the 553 programs to recommend State staff development in administrative management by objectives or other approaches which result in systematic administrative practices. The twenty-five states receiving major funding and fifteen other states developed training projects focused no more than \$20,000 each on State staff training in more effective management. Another reason for the encouragement of State staff training was because two of the original fourteen States did not participate to any great degree in the 1971 funding cycle, due to a change of State directors and a realignment of the remaining staffs leaving no one committed to a systematic strategy for personnel development.

It was important that the whole staff be trained.

The funding of the twenty-five States was based on approval of a Supplement on Personnel Development submitted with their State Plan for Vocational Education July 1, 1970. With the funding received, the fourteen states in 1970, and the twenty-five in 1971, had funds available for cooperative arrangements with institutions, agencies or private companies for subcontracts for long or short term training activities, either preservice or inservice. The total number of subprojects from these States alone, over the two year span, was some 250. In addition, there were special developmental projects. Also, there were 30 special projects in the states who were part of the Technical Assistance Program which were for State staff training and for projects focused on the handicapped or the disadvantaged.

Until the latter part of the 1971 funding cycle, few of the major funding States had anyone full-time as a Personnel Development Coordinator. This made it very difficult for any State to have a facilitator available to do the necessary developmental work for a subproject focused on vocational education of the handicapped. What can be done during the 1972 funding cycle to insure the development of viable personnel development subprojects directed toward vocational education for the handicapped?

14. Term States Defined

States, as used in this paper, is a generic term which includes the fifty States, District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands,

Guam, American Samoa and the Pacific Trust Territories. All of these can participate in the Section 553 program authorized by the Vocational Education Amendments. All of them except Virginia will be participating in the Part F, Section 553 program in 1972.

15. The 553 Program in 1972

The 553 program is now called - State Systems for Personnel Development (Vocational Education) Program which includes what was the Cooperative Arrangements Program and the Technical Assistance Program. The Special Developmental Projects program for the 1972 funding cycle is considered separately and will have some programs funded through a State with SSPD funding and will have a few funded directly under Part D of EPDA. Because there were no particularly definitive preservice programs developed, the SDP will focus on this problem as well as on career education personnel development.

Each of the States participating in the State Systems program have an approved Supplement for Personnel Development. (This includes Virginia who did not request Part F funding in 1972). It has been recommended to all of them that a portion of the Part F funds be utilized, if funds are not otherwise available, to employ a full time Personnel Development Coordinator to not only manage the States Part F funded projects, but primarily to coordinate all vocational education personnel development in the State system. This would

insure a person on the State staff with the time and expertize:

(a) to refine the needs assessment in the system, (b) to work with local schools in developing and implementing their inservice plans, (c) to plan with the institutions of higher education in designing personnel development programs appropriate to the clustering strategy of new look in vocational education, (d) to participate in the development of articulation necessary with academic and special education in order to implement career education and (e) to work with the State staff on a strategies needed to insure a smooth transition and articulation between vocational education and career education.

When the State Plan for Vocational Education is filed July 1, 1972, all the information previously required in the Supplement will be included in the one planning document. This will be an important aspect of the personnel development coordinators responsibility to see that this is well articulated in the final document. What strategy needs to be developed to secure a commitment to the vocational needs of the handicapped?

It must be remembered that in vocation teacher education, perhaps more than any other part of education, there is, as Robert Taylor and Aaron Miller of the Ohio Center for Vocational Education pointed out:

"multi-institutional involvement in vocational education (i.e., state departments, college or university, local districts may all be involved) we should examine the unique capacity of each of these agencies to contribute to the effective fulfillment of these functions. This will help to establish their individual roles and ultimately their organizational structure" (7., pages 208-209).

What can be done to identify performance based measures needed by professional personnel in vocational education working with the handicapped? How can we develop cost-conscious educational reform designed to permit learning according to individual styles or handicaps?

"TWO MILLION WITHOUT SKILLS"

SECTION THREE

CONCLUSIONS

- A. The Questions from an analysis
of the legislation and its administration
- B. The Summary

"TWO MILLION WITHOUT SKILLS"

Section Three

CONCLUSIONS

A. The Questions

Introduction: The following questions are compiled from the analysis of affective Federal legislation and its administration in the preceding section of this paper. A process for starting to find answers to these on devising short and long term strategies for seeking the answers to the questions is discussed following these questions in the Summary. The questions are arranged in the order they appear in the previous Sections:

- EDUCATION OF THE HANDICAPPED (P.L. 91-230)

- (1) To anyone with a vocational education background, could EHA leave the impression that academically oriented education was of primary important?
- (2) Does the exclusion of any mention of vocational education tend to de-emphasize its importance in the education of the handicapped?
- (3) What kind of communicating process is necessary to rectify this kind of a problem (the equating of career and vocational education as terms with one meaning)?
- (4) What resources other than funds can be utilized (by BEH) to insure that career education is effective for the handicapped, if they do not commit BEH funds?

- (5) What kind of strategies can BEH develop to encourage this assumption of responsibility (by the school system for assisting a student in the clarification of his goals, etc.)?

• VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1968 (P.L. 90-576)

- (1) What is their role (of expert on handicapped appointed to State advisory council for vocational education) perceived to be by those who appoint them, those who serve with them and those who serve in this role?
- (2) How is this "at least ten per centum" (for the handicapped under VEA) administered by the States?
- (3) Is the present method of disbursing the funds (for the handicapped student) centered on being sure that the ten per cent is spent only on the handicapped, or on the need of the handicapped student for high quality vocational education based on his needs?
- (4) How can State Boards (for Vocational Education) be motivated to the commitment necessary for quality vocational education for the handicapped whose need has been communicated by Congress?
- (6a) If it is desirable, as many special educators believe, to offer viable education for as many handicapped children as possible within the regular schools, would this not be a particularly important approach for vocational education to investigate?

(6b) How can this 'probability' (that handicapped student will make an effective adjustment) receive serious consideration as a step to be taken by vocational education?

(6c) How can a forum be developed which encourages input from both vocational educators and special educators?

• EDUCATION PROFESSIONS DEVELOPMENT ACT (P.L. 90-35)

(6) If the vocational educators, such as the 11 project directors (LDP), commit themselves to a concern for developing instructional personnel who can work with the handicapped in the regular program, how can equal concern or commitment be developed by special education for the handicapped?

(9) Can the need of two million without skills, be met by a vocational education commitment alone?

(12) How can a concern be developed for training professionals to make the appropriate vocational and special education articulation happen?

(13) What can be done during the 1972 funding cycle to insure the development of viable personnel development sub-projects directed toward vocational education for the handicapped?

- (15) What strategy needs to be developed to secure a commitment to the vocational needs of the handicapped?
- (15) What can be done to identify performance based measures needed by professional personnel in vocational education working with the handicapped?
- (15) How can we develop cost-conscious educational reform designed to permit learning according to individual styles or handicaps?

Conclusion: The overall conclusion which can be drawn from the questions compiled above is that there is a communications gap. The role of many of the staff members concerned with the implementation of the legislation are not perceived in such a way that a commitment has developed to vocational education for the handicapped. This analysis by identifying some of the more obvious problems should be a helpful tool in attempts to solve the problem.

"TWO MILLION WITHOUT SKILLS"

Section Three

CONCLUSIONS

B. The Summary

1. Affective As A Bureaucratic Term

Affective Federal legislation and its administration? Affective is defined as relating to feelings or emotion (15., page 15). The emotional element in this reference is both the climate in which the legislation is enacted and the emotional protectiveness developed by those who administer such legislation. Survival in a bureaucracy is frequently accomplished by protectionism with all its emotional connotations. Each Bureau tends to set its boundaries within the context of the authorizing legislation and dares anyone to intrude. (16., pages 229-235). The most difficult kind of legislation to administer effectively is that which cuts across these boundaries, as the preceding analysis indicates for the three pieces of legislation concerned with vocational education for the handicapped. When this is recognized by facilitators at a sufficiently high enough level of administration, then many kinds of effective liaison can be developed if it is not imposed liaison without involvement. This analysis is the effect of a communications gap which has no doubt existed since special education sought separation. In pinpointing some of these gaps by the questions listed in Part A of this Section, it is hoped that this paper will communicate and not merely utter.

2. Results of Project Officers Experiences

From the experience that BEPD project officers, as well as the directors of the projects they monitored, have had since 1965 with teacher training projects, there has developed a strong belief in BEPD that training classroom teachers to work with handicapped children in their regular classes enables teachers to become more effective with the disadvantaged child (9.). Training teachers in the prescriptive approach of special education could well be a distinct advantage to vocational education teachers in individualizing instruction for all of its students. This would seem to be particularly appropriate at this point of time while shifting gears for career education and for clustering the vocational component of it with its emphasis on individualizing instruction. As in the automobile industry when changing models the planning and engineering is done before production is well on its way.

As a project officer, my experience with the changes accomplished by Federal leadership in encouraging the use of new and emerging concepts of administration toward an evolving systematic approach to personnel development in vocational education (14 and unpublished documentation in VEPP) enables me to believe that there are percipients in the State offices of education who will not only perceive the need, but will work with the U.S. Office of Education in facilitating the development of effective vocational education for the handicapped by attempting to find answers to the questions raised by this analysis.

This experience is not entirely subjective, it is very pointedly described by Byrl Shoemaker, State Director of Vocational Education in Ohio in his presentation, MANAGEMENT BY OBJECTIVES AND PERSONNEL DEVELOPMENT FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION, to the Seminar for State Directors in Las Vegas, Nevada (14).

3. Recommended Use of the Analyses

In order to begin to close the communications gap, the first step should be the dissemination of this paper to the appropriate personnel in the three Bureaus. It must be kept in mind that the accuracy of the analysis is dependent on what was perceived in EHA-BEH and VEA68-BAVTE by an analyzer who is not a part of their organization. The analyses are valid only in so far as the perception is accurate.

The second step could be the designation of liaison staff from each of the three Bureaus to discuss and dissect the analysis of their respective bailiwicks and present their perception of the roles of the other two Bureaus in meeting the need for vocational education for the handicapped. Short term and long term strategies could be devised and implemented for seeking answers to the questions raised by this paper. The overriding question that needs to be answered is: Why are there relatively few meaningful programs for the handicapped? This, of course, needs to be followed by what can we do about it and how can we do it?

"TWO MILLION WITHOUT SKILLS"

BIBLIOGRAPHY*

1. Perkins, Carl, Chairman, Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, 92nd Congress, 1st Session: A COMPILATION OF FEDERAL EDUCATION LAWS (U.S. Government Printing Office, October, 1971).
2. Marland, Sidney P., Jr.: A STRENGTHENING ALLIANCE, presentation of U.S. Commissioner of Education before the 54th Annual Meeting of the American Council on Education (Shoreham Hotel, October 7, 1971).
3. Center for Occupational Education, John Coster, Director: CAREER EDUCATION DOCUMENTS (Raleigh, North Carolina, October, 1971).
4. Hilton, E. P. and Gyuro, Steven J.: A SYSTEMS APPROACH 1970 VOCATIONAL EDUCATION HANDBOOK FOR STATE PLAN DEVELOPMENT AND PREPARATION (Frankfort, Kentucky, Bureau of Vocational Education, 1970).
5. Bottoms, Gene and Matheny, Kenneth B.: A GUIDE FOR THE DEVELOPMENT, IMPLEMENTATION AND ADMINISTRATION OF EXEMPLARY PROGRAMS AND PROJECTS IN VOCATIONAL EDUCATION (Atlanta, Georgia, BAVTE National Conference on Exemplary Programs and Projects, March, 1969).

6. Drucker, Peter F.: TECHNOLOGY, MANAGEMENT AND SOCIETY (New York and Evanston, Harper and Row, Publishers, Essays collected and published, 1970).
7. Evans, Rupert N. and Terry, David R., Editors: VOCATIONAL TEACHER EDUCATION (Springfield, Illinois under grant to develop State of the Art paper funded by DHEW-OE-BEPD under the Education Professions Development Act, 1971).
8. Barr, Donald: WHO PUSHED HUMPTY DUMPTY? Dilemmas in American Education Today (New York, Atheneum, 1971)
9. Reynold, Maynard C. and Davis, Malcolm D., Editors: EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN IN REGULAR CLASSROOMS (Washington, D.C. Leadership Training Institute/Special Education, funded by DHEW-OE-BEPD under the Education Professions Development Act, 1971).
10. Herr, Edwin L.: UNIFYING AN ENTIRE SYSTEM OF EDUCATION AROUND A CAREER DEVELOPMENT THEME (A working paper developed on the implementation of Exemplary Programs authorized by Part D of the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968, Washington, D.C., DHEW-OE-BAVTE, Exemplary Programs, 1969).
11. Vocational Education Amendments of 1968: RULES AND REGULATIONS DHEW-OE, Bureau of Adult, Vocational and Technical Education, January, 1969).

12. Unpublished list of Research and Development projects which is available in DHEW, Division of Research, Washington, D.C.)
13. ARM, Abstracts of Research and Related Materials in Vocational Education, Special Needs Section; issued by the ERIC Clearinghouse on Vocational and Technical Education, Ohio State University (Columbus, Ohio, Fall, 1970).
14. Shoemaker, Byrl: MANAGEMENT BY OBJECTIVES AND PERSONNEL DEVELOPMENT FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION, presentation to Seminar of State Directors of Vocational Education in Las Vegas, Nevada (Columbus, Ohio, Ohio Center for Vocational Education, September 15, 1971).
15. Webster's Seventh New Collegiate Dictionary, based on Webster's Third New International Dictionary (Springfield, MA., G & C Merriam Co., 1963)
16. Kimbrough, Ralph B: ADMINISTRATING ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS (New York, The MacMillan Company, 1968)

*All of the references listed are directly referred to in the text of this paper.

IDENTIFICATION OF ALPHABET TERMS

DHEW	- Department of Health, Education & Welfare
U.S.O.E.	- United States Office of Education
EHA	- Education for the Handicapped Act
BEH	- Bureau for Education of the Handicapped
VEA68	- Vocational Education Amendments of 1968
BAVTE	- Bureau of Adult, Vocational & Technical Education
DVTE	- Division of Vocational & Technical Education
EPDA	- Education Professions Development Act
BEPD	- Bureau of Educational Personnel Development
NCIES	- National Center for Improving Educational Systems
VEPP	- Vocational Education Personnel Program
LDP	- Leadership Development Program
SDP	- Special Developmental Project

APPENDIX III

LISTING OF ABSTRACTS FOR RESEARCH PROJECTS Vocational Education for the Handicapped*

VT 001 431 - Chaffin, Jerry D., and Others, A Selected Demonstration for the Vocational Training of Mentally Retarded Youth in Public High Schools. Final Report. (Vocational Rehabilitation Administration (DHEW), Washington D.C. - Sep 67); VT 002 717 - Vocationally Handicapped Indians, Rehabilitation by College Education. Summary of Final Report. (Northern Montana Coll., Havre Montana Div. of Vocational Rehabilitation Helena - Sep 66); VT 007 515 - Shulman, Lee S. - The Vocational Development of Mentally Handicapped Adolescents: An Experimental and Longitudinal Study. Final Report. Monograph No. 6. (Jewish Vocational Service, Chicago, Ill., Michigan State Univ., East Lansing. Coll. of Education Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C., Aug 67); VT 007 543 - Minutes, Annual Meeting (Washington, D.C. May, 1968). President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped; Washington, D.C.; VT 008 511 Spencer, Gary, A Comparative Study of the Reducation of Dependency in Found Low-Income Housing Projects: A Descriptive and Conceptual Introduction. Rehabilitation in Poverty Settings-Report Number One. Monograph No. 4. (Northeastern Univ., Boston, Mass. New England Rehabilitation Research and Demonstration Inst.; Rehabilitation Services Administration (DHEW), Washington, D.C.); VT 008 512 - Goldin, George J. Perry, Sally L., Dependency and Its Implications for Rehabilitation. Northeastern Studies in Vocational Rehabilitation. Monograph No. 1 (Northeastern Univ., Boston, Mass. New England Rehabilitation Research and Demonstration Inst.; Rehabilitation Services Administration (DHEW), Washington, D.C.); VT 008 705 - Occupational Education Program: Secondary Schools. (Delaware State Dept. of Public Instruction, Dover Delaware Occupational Research and Coordinating Unit, Dover - March 17, 1969); VT 009 259 - Comprehensive Statewide Planning Project for Vocational Rehabilitation Services. Final Report (May 1, 1967 to April 30, 1969). Florida State Dept. of Education, Tallahassee. Div. of Vocational Rehabilitation, Rehabilitation Services Administration (DHEW), Washington, D.C. (Apr 69).; VT 009 399 ED 039 317- Hoover, Roy M., and Others, Rehabilitation Services; Ideal Services Series. Volumes 1-6. Florida State Dept. of Education, Tallahassee. Rehabilitation Facilities Section, 1968); VT 009 904 ED 038 495 - Davis, Rene V.; Lofquist, Lloyd H., A Follow-up Survey of Former Clients of the Minnesota Division of Vocational Rehabilitation. Minnesota Studies in Vocational Rehabilitation: XXVI. Bulletin 50. Minnesota Univ., Minneapolis. Industrial Relations Center, Minnesota State Dept. of Education, St. Paul. Div. of Vocational Rehabilitation, (Apr 69).; VT 010 283 ED 036 633 - Comprehensive Statewide Planning for Vocational Rehabilitation Services. Final Report, Volume II. (Governor's Study Commission on Vocational Rehabilitation in Virginia, Richmond Rehabilitation Services Administration (DHEW), Washington, D.C., Oct 68).; VT 010 284 ED 036 634 - Comprehensive Statewide Planning for Vocational Rehabilitation Services. Final Report, Volume I. (Governor's Study Commission on Vocational Rehabilitation in

Virginia, Richmond Rehabilitation Services Administration (DHEW), Washington, D.C., Oct. 68).; VT 010 291 ED 038 502 - Hoskins, John E. A Study of Certain Characteristics Which have Predict Value for Vocational Adjustment in a Rehabilitation Workshop. (Goodwill Industries of Greater Detroit, Mich., Wayne State Univ., Detroit. Dept. of Special Education and Vocational Rehabilitation 64).

*From ABSTRACTS OF RESEARCH AND RELATED MATERIALS IN VOCATIONAL AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION, (Eric Clearinghouse on Vocational and Technical Education, The Center for Vocational and Technical Education, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, Fall, 1970).